Reseñas

VÁZQUEZ GONZÁLEZ, Juan Gabriel, MARTÍNEZ VÁZQUEZ, Montserrat and RON VAZ, Pilar (eds)[1]. 2006. *The Historical Linguistics – Cognitive Linguistics Interface*. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Huelva. (258 pp).ISBN 84-96373-80-0.

The book under review is yet another example of the fruitful relationship that historical approaches to the study of language and dynamic-oriented fields such as functional-cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, pragmatics and anthropology, among others, have shared from the early eighties. On the one hand, these theoretical-dynamic approaches are helping to unravel the past with their new analytical concepts and methodological tools and, on the other, historical linguistics is helping to corroborate the findings of these theoretical models of present-day stages of language.

This healthy relationship and the fact that historical linguistics is at the core of linguistic research today is confirmed, in addition to the volume under review, by the number and quality of the publications and contributions made by this area of research to the most prestigious international journals and conferences in the last 25 years. Topics such as *grammaticalization* and *processes of semantic change* are core issues in discussions at international and Spanish linguistics conferences such as ESSE, ICLC, AEDEAN, AESLA and AELCO, among others. At the same time,

---

[1] Montserrat Martínez Vázquez is Lecturer at the Department of Philology and Translation of the Universidad Pablo de Olavide in Sevilla. Her main fields of research are contrastive English-Spanish grammar and translation studies. Pilar Ron Vaz is Senior Lecturer at the English Department of the Universidad de Huelva. Her main interests of research are within the fields of contrastive English-Spanish grammar, pragmatics and discourse studies. She has also worked extensively on teaching/learning improvement and technological innovation. Juan Gagriel Vázquez González is Lecturer at the English Department of the Universidad de Huelva, where he has been interested in the fields of English historical linguistics, functional-cognitive linguistics and corpus linguistics.

notions such as *prototypicality*, *metaphor* and *metonymy* are present in the works debated in international historical linguistics conferences such as ICEHL, SELIM, ICHL, among others.

It has, then, been interdisciplinary research which has contributed to the revival of historical linguistics, and, of all theoretical frameworks, it has been cognitive[2] the model which has contributed most to this renewal. Let me briefly explain the reasons for the interest of cognitivists in language change processes.

One first reason for the attention of cognitivists to language change is that *integration* and *interdisciplinarity*, key concepts of historical approaches to language, are also notions central to the cognitive approach. As we know, within functional-cognitive linguistics, language is understood not as an independent, autonomous entity, but as integrated within the other human cognitive abilities, which today can only be studied as the interaction of psychological, experiential and socio-cultural factors (Bernárdez 2004, 2008a). Cognitivists have insisted on the *ever-changing*, *dynamic* and *flexible* character of linguistic categories and constructions (Lakoff 1987, Lakoff and Johnson 1999, Langaker 1987, 1999, Talmy 2000a, 2000b, Taylor 2003, among others) since the birth of the model, stressing the epistemological consequences of eliminating historicity from science in general and linguistics in particular. As Bernárdez 2008a states, abandoning a historical perspective of science –including linguistics- during most of the 20th century led the natural and human sciences to follow the path of unique thought, both from a theoretical and methodological point of view. Only a historical approach that takes into account social and cultural factors can help us understand present day research with the necessary context and distance, and help science advance by explaining, and not only describing. It seems that cognitive linguistics has always been ahead of other theoretical models in this historical crusade. The theoretical view that synchrony and diachrony overlap is not new; it was already present in the pre-structuralist historical approach (Geeraerts 2006) and reintroduced by the functional-cognitive paradigm in the late 1970s, early eighties. What is new, then, is its epistemological force. While a synchronic perspective on language shows chaos, a diachronic one shows systematicity and recurrent paths of change[3] (Antilla 1993, Bernárdez 1995, Tejada 1999 and Radden and Panther 2004, among others).

---

[2] It is not unusual to find chapters titled "Language across time: Historical Linguistics", "Grammaticalization", etc. in recent publications in the field, such as: Dirven and Verspoor 1998, Ungerer and Schmid 1996, Evans and Green 2006.

[3] "Chaos" in this context is related to the morphodynamic sense of the term (Thom 1977): a characteristic of all complex systems whose development can only be predicted in a non-deterministic way, that is, by studying the interaction of a wide number and variety of parameters, both external and internal (social and cognitive in the case of language). This approach to language change clearly coincides with Radden and Panther's (2004:4) view of

Before I focus on the different contributions, I would like to point out another reason for the revival of historical linguistics in the last thirty years: the new methodological possibilities of historical computerized corpora, a fact that is present in many of the contributions in the volume under review. Research within historical linguistics has been corroborated by electronic data retrieval devices for a long time now with tools such as the *Microfiche Concordance to Old English* from 1980 and the *Helsinki Corpus of English Texts* from 1991. Within cognitive linguistics the situation has been rather different, though rapidly changing in recent years. Even though solid empirical research is one of the main foundational prerequisites of the theory (Langacker 1987), it is only recently that researchers in this field have emphasized -and are still insisting on- the need for statistical analyses of real language usage based on computer corpora to sustain the theoretical findings (Geeraerts 2003, Bernárdez 2008b)[4]. Cognitive linguistics can no longer afford, say these scholars, to ignore variation in language, nor can it fail to adopt an empirical methodology that reflects language as it actually occurs, beyond the limited knowledge of the individual observer.

Having sketched the context, I turn now to the volume under review. *The Historical Linguistics – Cognitive Linguistics Interface*, a collection of ten papers selected from the "9th English Seminar: *The Historical Linguistics-Cognitive Linguistics Interface*" (Huelva 2004), which brought together a heterogeneous group of Spanish scholars, all sharing the same theoretical model, the same dynamic approach to language and the same passion for exploring the past. The papers included in the book are mainly based on the most central cognitive issues such as metonymy, metaphor, polysemy, grammatical constructions, the categories of COLOUR, SPACE and EMOTIONS, as well as on some of the model's most recent developments such as historical dialectal variation. In what follows, then, I address some of the issues that I find most significant in each of the ten contributions to this volume.

The first paper, *Metonymy in Meaning and Form, with Special Attention to its Role in Lexical Semantic Change* by Antonio Barcelona, is especially valuable for its review of the concept of metonymy in cognitive linguistics as well as for the interesting case study presented. In the first part of the paper, Barcelona explains his own conception of metonymy –which he calls "schematic"; a highly comprehensive approach in which metonymy is understood as the interaction of cognitive, linguistic, pragmatic and cultural factors. Metonymy, according to the

---

motivation: *".. A linguistic unit (target) is motivated if some of its properties are shaped by a linguistic source (form and/or content) and language-independent factors*".

[4] Recent works within the cognitive paradigm which include computerized corpora analyses are: Deignan 2005, Stefanowitsch and Gries 2007 and Gries and Stefanowitsch 2007. Also worth mentioning is section two in Kristiansen and Dirven 2008, titled "Usage-based variation research in cognitive sociolinguistics".

author, is ubiquitous in language and thought and seems to be even more basic than metaphor (Barcelona 2002). After providing many, and interesting, examples of this cognitive tenet in paralinguistic symbols such as gestures, pragmatic inferencing contexts of certain speech acts and within certain phonological and grammatical structures, Barcelona explains the semantic evolution or grammaticalization of the Old English noun *lot* into the determiner *a lot of* and into the quantifier *a lot* as the succession of metonymical mappings or chains throughout the history of English.

Javier Díaz Vera's work, *Calculating Indexes of Lexical Convergence and Divergence through Time and Space*, is a good example of a balanced combination of theoretical premises and empirical analysis. Díaz Vera uses diverse synchronic and diachronic lexicographic and text corpora to study three different semantic fields throughout the history of English and Scots. That is, he chooses an onomasiological approach in the study of the field or category of verbs of REMEMBERING in Old English, verbs of TASTING from Old English to Middle English and the lexis of MARRIAGE in Early Modern English and Scots. It is interesting to see how the author integrates cognitive and functional theoretical concepts such as *onomasiological saliency* (Geeraerts 1997) and *lexical iconic principle* (Faber and Mairal 1994), proving their usefulness within the field of linguistic variety, both diachronic and geographical, and finding culture-specific differences within his contrastive analysis.

Francisco Gonzálvez García's paper, *The Fortunes of the Competition between the Accusative and Infinitive and the NP + PRED Complement Constructions after Verba Cogitandi in English: A Construction Grammar View*, is a thorough and lengthy explanation of the evolution of the AcI and NP + PRED complement constructions which combines the notions of construction grammar (Goldberg 1995) with a profusion of data, examples and charts coming from synchronic and diachronic corpora. The author presents a detailed review of the literature on the topic before concluding that these two different but interrelated structures correspond to Goldberg's *subjective* transitive and *subjective-within-objective* transitive constructions, respectively. Finally, Gonzálvez García propounds a dynamic interplay between usage, synchronic variation and diachronic variation, as well as an interaction of semantico-pragmatic and discursive factors in the evolution and asymmetries of these two structures.

In A *Cognitive Approach to the Diachronic Study of Spatial Prepositions*, Mª Carmen Guarddon Anelo brings data from Old English into one of the most paradigmatic fields of cognitive linguistics: the study of closed-class categories, specifically prepositions, as linguistic elements showing a similar conceptual and organizing behaviour to open-class or lexical items. Guarddon presents a contrastive analysis of prepositions *in*, *on* and *at* in two periods of English: Old and Present-day English, and shows how the theoretical tools used by cognitive synchronic studies of prepositions, *image schemas* and *prototypes*, should be

revised in order to explain why the evolution -from fewer to more senses and from more physical to more abstract- anticipated by cognitive semantics, does not happen in this case study. In my opinion, it would be interesting to complete the historical description by studying the intermediate stages of the process, Middle and Modern English, and to look for socio-cultural factors beneath the differences in categorial and spatial perception of the prepositions in the periods studied.

Isabel Verdaguer and Natalia Laso's article *Polysemy in a Corpus of Scientific English* presents the application of one the most basic prerequisites of cognitive linguistics, this is, the pervasiveness of polysemy at all levels of language, to the lexis of present-day scientific English. The case under study, the noun ACCOUNT, analyses common multi-word vocabulary of scientific English, both from a synchronic and a diachronic perspective, a fairly new field of research. Using data from different synchronic and diachronic corpora and dictionaries, Verdaguer and Laso show the highly polysemic nature of non-specialized scientific lexis, as well as the universal paths of semantic change, from more concrete to more abstract and from more lexical to more grammatical and discursive, followed by multi-word expressions containing the noun ACCOUNT.

In *Polysemy, Metaphor and Diachrony. A Cross-Linguistic Study of Body Metaphors*, Regina Gutiérrez Pérez offers a preliminary synchronic approach to the study of fourteen linguistic expressions containing nouns from the category of BODY-PART terms in five Present-day Indo-European languages (English, German, Spanish, French and Italian). Both the topic and the cross-linguistic approach of this paper are central to the interests of cognitive linguistics today and, therefore, will contribute to the debate between the culture-specificity and universality of metaphor, as well as to the basicness of metaphor or metonymy debates. The study, in my opinion, needs to expand the range of languages and the number of linguistic metaphors analysed in order to corroborate its hypothesis: the universal nature of human embodiment.

In *The BIG-EYE Metaphor: An Experientalist Approach*, González Porras follows Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) experiential bodily basis of meaning to present a first picture of a contrastive study of one of the linguistic expressions of the conceptual metaphor for GREED in three languages: "come con los ojos" (Spanish), "his eyes are bigger than his stomach" (English) and the adjective "big-eye" (Caribbean English). This study will certainly make important contributions to the field of cross-cultural metaphor studies by taking a more comprehensive, onomasiological approach to the study of GREED and by incorporating more data and sample languages into the study.

José L. Oncins-Martínez's paper, *Notes on the Metaphorical Basis of Sexual Language in Early Modern English*, is an original contribution to cognitive metaphor studies for different reasons: First, because little has been said about the semantic field of sex within this theoretical model, and even less about the topic in 16th and 17th century English. And, second, because the author not only uses the tools of cognitive theory in his analysis of the metaphor SEX IS AGRICULTURE,

but also relates the overlexicalization of this semantic field and the richness of the scope of metaphor of the Early Modern English period to socio-cultural factors such as the changes operating in the land property system of the time, and the discovery and colonization of territories in the New World, factors which, the author argues, helped to shape men's conceptualization of sex.

The EMOTION IS HEAT (OF FIRE) Metaphor: An Old English Validation, by Juan Gabriel Vázquez González, is another good example of how empirical analysis of data are being combined with theoretical concepts in the field of English historical linguistics today. Vázquez González scrutinizes Old English dictionaries and corpora to extract all the words belonging to the category FIRE and so understand how the Anglo-Saxons conceptualized and expressed the EMOTION IS HEAT OF FIRE metaphor, a paradigmatic conceptual metaphor in the cognitive literature. His results have implications not only for cross-linguistic studies -they show both similarities and culture-specific realizations of the metaphor in the different periods, but also for historical onomasiological studies, since the author shows how the different members of the semantic field FIRE, the source domain for EMOTION, change their saliency throughout the history of English because of their interactions and the introduction of borrowings from French.

The last contribution to this volume is Pilar Ron Vaz's paper *Coloring the Anglo-Saxon World of Emotions*. The semantic field or category of COLOUR TERMS, we know, has been one of the earliest paradigmatic case studies of linguistic theory from the structural approach to cognitive linguistics and psychology. In her contrastive study of the conceptual metaphor DARK THINGS ARE NEGATIVE, Ron Vaz provides, first, further evidence for the cognitive bases of the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS COLOR. Secondly, the author shows, through interesting examples, the differences in the perception and conceptualization of the metaphor in Old and Present-day English, specifically at the white/brightness pole of the hue continuum. These differences, according to the author, would be based on socio-cultural factors.

The book's most important contribution or strength, I feel, is the fact that all the works presented, rather than mere descriptions of the data, are based on solid theoretical tenets of cognitive linguistics. While these tenets have already been corroborated by extensive contrastive synchronic studies in many languages of the world, they also needed and still need to be checked against diachronic data. The book, thus, applies key issues in the cognitive model to different stages of the English language, such as the incidence of metonymy as one of the most basic triggers of grammaticalization processes, diachronic explanations of grammatical constructions, contrastive historical descriptions of spatial prepositions and of metaphors for EMOTION, SEX, COLOUR and BODY-PART terms. What is especially interesting about the volume, in short, is that it provides more evidence for the model's claim that cognitive, linguistic and pragmatic factors all need to be

integrated together with socio-cultural ones in the study of both synchronic and diachronic language processes.

A second major contribution of the volume to the fields of both English historical linguistics and cognitive linguistics is the fact that several of the studies use empirical research based on computerized corpora to support their findings. Especially worth mentioning is the use by Díaz Vera of the data provided by the *Thesaurus of Old English* (Roberts, Kay and Grundy 1995) and the Middle English section of the *Helsinki Corpus* to calculate the degree of onomasiological change in the semantic field of TASTING from Old to Middle English. The study by Vázquez González also examines the data provided by the *Thesaurus of Old English* in order to validate the scope of the conceptual metaphor EMOTION IS FIRE in Old English.

As I have shown, the papers make up a consistent volume focusing on topics in the field of English historical linguistics and cognitive linguistics. There is a balance between diachronic linguistic studies, as is the case of the contributions by Barcelona, Díaz Vera, Gonzálvez García and Verdaguer and Laso, and synchronic studies from older stages of the English language such as the works of Guarddon, Oncins, Vázquez González, Ron Vaz, Gutiérrez Pérez and González Porras. The studies presented by these two last authors on body-metaphors, are very challenging topics of research within the field because of their cross-linguistic perspective. They are in fact still at the initial stages of the analyses and, in my opinion, should have been further polished before including them in the book. Contributions that are probably quite different today, four years after the Conference took place.

Finally, as this volume shows, traditional descriptive studies in historical linguistics are becoming a thing of the past. This collection of papers shows we have the theoretical and methodological tools which enable us to contribute to the advance of learning in the field and that there is a very active group of scholars using them. This proves the intellectual vitality of the research area in Spain today. Vázquez, Martínez and Ron's volume will be of interest to researchers and teachers of both English theoretical and historical linguistics, and especially to doctoral students who are now at the stage of learning how to do research within these overlapping and complementary fields: cognitive and historical linguistics.

REFERENCES

ANTTILA, Raimo (1993). Change and metatheory at the beginning of the 1990's: the primacy of history. In Charles, Jones, ed., *Historical Linguistics. Problems and Perspectives*. London: Longman, 43-73.

BARCELONA, Antonio (2002). Clarifying and applying the notions of metaphor and metonymy within cognitive linguistics: an update. In Dirven, René and Ralf Pörings

eds., *Metaphor and Metonymy in Comparison and Contrast* (Cognitive Linguistics Research 20). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 207-277.

BERNÁRDEZ, Enrique (1995). *Teoría y Epistemología del Texto*. Madrid: Cátedra.

BERNÁRDEZ, Enrique (2004). Intimate enemies? On the relations between language and culture. In Soares da Silva, Augusto, Amadeu Torres and Miguel Gonçalves eds., *Linguagem, Cultura e Cognição: Estudos de Linguística Cognitiva*, vol. 1. Coimbra: Almedina, 21-46.

BERNÁRDEZ, Enrique (2008a) *El lenguaje como Cultura: Una Crítica del Discurso sobre el Lenguaje*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

BERNÁRDEZ, Enrique (2008b). *Tipología Lingüística: Tipología del Uso*. Lecture delivered at the VI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Española de Lingüística Cognitiva (AELCO) Castellón (Spain).

GEERAERTS, Dirk (2003). *A Social Approach to Cognitive Linguistics*. Lecture delivered at the 8ICLC (International Cognitive Linguistics Conference) Logroño (Spain).

GEERAERTS, Dirk (2006) The theoretical and descriptive development of lexical semantics. *Words and other Wonders. Papers on Lexical and Semantic Topics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 398-415.

GRIES, Stefan Th. and Anatol STEFANOWITSCH eds., (2007). *Corpora in Cognitive Linguistics. Corpus-Based Approaches to Syntax and Lexis*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

KRISTIANSEN, Gitte, Michael ARCHARD, René DIRVEN & Francisco RUIZ DE MENDOZA eds., (2006). *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

KRISTIANSEN, Gitte and Rená DIRVEN eds., (2008). *Cognitive Sociolinguistics: Language Variation, Cultural Models and Social Systems.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

LAKOFF, George and Mark JOHNSON (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh: The Embodied Mind and its Challenges to Western Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

LANGACKER, Ron (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. I. Theoretical Prerequisites.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

LANGACKER, Ron (1999). *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

RADDEN, Günter and Klaus-Uwe Panther eds., (2004). *Studies in Linguistic Motivation*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

TALMY, Leonard (2000a). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol I: Concept Structuring Systems.* Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.

TALMY, Leonard (2000b). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol II: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge Mass: The MIT Press.

TAYLOR, John R. (2003/1995). *Linguistic Categorization. Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

TEJADA, Paloma (1999). *El Cambio Lingüístico. Claves para Interpretar la Lengua Inglesa*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

THOM, René (1977/1987). *Estabilidad estructural y morfogénesis: Ensayo de una teoría general de los modelos*. Barcelona: Gedisa.

JOHN PIER AND JOSÉ ÁNGEL GARCÍA LANDA, eds. *Theorizing Narrativity*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. 464 pp. ISBN 978-3-11-020244-1.

Everyone can name a compilation of essays that has inaugurated a new discipline or changed the tack of an existing one significantly. In the field of stylistics, for instance, one can readily invoke the collective work *Style in Language* edited by Thomas Sebeok in 1960. As is widely known, it contains the papers and subsequent discussions generated by the 1958 Bloomington conference on style, and in particular Roman Jakobson's concluding statement "Linguistics and Poetics," which contributed to the consolidation of a persistent craze about the poetic sequence being the site of phenomena usually restricted to the paradigmatic organization of verbal resources. It is hard to say whether *Theorizing Narrativity*—partly the outcome of a seminar meeting on narratology held in Zaragoza in 200—will achieve a similar status within the canon of narrative theory. This depends on many factors, most of them only explainable by the postulates of chaos theory, but, prima facie, this volume seems to satisfy all the requisites to become a landmark of contemporary narratology. In this respect, and apart from the uncontested academic stature of its contributors, the main asset of *Theorizing Narrativity* is the wise combination of classical notions sensibly updated and of highly original topics that threaten to dissolve the once well-set contours of the narrative genre. So Gerald Prince's basically immanent notion of narrativity is complemented from outside the text by the pragmatic constraints of what he calls *narratability*, and, thus enriched, the resulting concept engages in a breath-taking dialogue with purely pragmatic and performative ideations of narrativity as put forward, say, by Beatriz Penas and David Rudrum, as well as with the dazzling discussion of the disputed narrative properties of virtual reality and computer games that Marie-Laure Ryan offers in her paper on transfictionality. Taken as a whole, this collection of essays can be viewed as a successful blend of classical and postclassical narratological notions coupled with cultural and contextual issues, evincing that narrative theory has followed a course quite akin to that of twentieth-century linguistics, i.e. from a blind word-centredness to the rigorous consideration of the roles played by producers and consumers of texts in a specific socio-cultural setting.

Pinpointing the exact nature of narrativity has truly become an overriding obsession with latter-day narratology. Somehow it is felt that this notion constitutes the main crux of narrative studies, for its precise delineation would eventually disclose the *differentia specifica* of narrative discourse and thus chart at a stroke a fundamental territory of literary theory. But such precise delineation does not seem to be forthcoming. Narrativity could be minimally defined as that which turns a semiotic artifact—whether verbal or not—into a narrative or into

something perceptible as one. Of course, this definition is deceptively simple and, apart from making everything contingent on what one understands as a narrative, throws into relief the massive conceptual change implied in choosing between two wordings that, at a cursory glance, may look almost equivalent, i.e. "into a narrative" and "into something perceptible as [a narrative]." In the first case, narrativity counts as an inherent property of the object and does not depend on contextual issues; in the second case, it is a kind of projection onto the semiotic medium of conventions, expectations, and perceptions of context-bound nature. *Theorizing Narrativity* veers between both poles, though it certainly gravitates towards the pragmatic one on account of its innovative thrust.

Thirteen papers plus an editorial introduction, a final bibliography, and an onomastic index make up this volume. The papers are not expressly classified into thematic sections, but, for the sake of presentation and discussion, the editors form six groups—not five, as they wrongly state in the introduction (9)—with explicit headings that describe the angle from which the capital notion of narrativity has been approached. Only one paper evades this grouping and acts as a preliminary frame of reference for readers to take their bearings amidst the intricate theoretical opulence of *Theorizing Narrativity*. In this paper, Gerald Prince distinguishes between narrativity, narrativehood, narrativeness, and narratability, the first one designating the general concept while the other three diverse aspects thereof. Narrativehood characterizes an object extensionally as a narrative; narrativeness refers to the possession by an object of a set of traits that may turn it into a narrative; and narratability is what other theorists call tellability or point, i.e. the capacity of an object to be perceived as a more or less successful narrative by its receivers. It should be noted that Prince positively adheres to a transitional or gradational view of narrativity and associate notions (21–22), whereby the narrative profile of an object can be higher or lower depending on the number of conditions it fulfils, a methodological outlook explicitly shared by most contributors to this collection.

Two papers are gathered by the editors under the heading of dynamism and anti-immanentism. Contrary to received accounts that tend to locate narrativity in the concrete judicial case but not in the law-code, Meir Sternberg argues that the modalized discourse of possibility, uncertainty, or non-factuality typical of legal statutes qualifies as narrative, and illustrates his inference by what he calls "if-plots," i.e. casuistic precepts of a fact-contingent nature that point to the future and can be reduced to minimal narrative sequences. John Pier, for his part, pursues narrativity against the background of the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy and concomitant notions, in combination with the strategies of heuristic reading—casual, naive, prospective—and semiotic reading—deliberate, critical, retrospective. Eventfulness and chance are the key words of the next heading, which brings together Peter Hühn's essay on the narrative relevance of eventfulness— a gradational concept based on the perception of events as more or

less radical departures from expected norms—and Werner Wolf's proposal of a set of parameters and steps to assess the role of chance in fiction as a clue to implied worldviews. The following section on pragmatic and performative perspectives on narrative comprises two papers, one by Beatriz Penas and another by David Rudrum. Penas' work transfers to the narrative text the pragmatic principle that the propositional meaning of a sentence need not coincide with its intended meaning as a real, context-bound utterance. She proposes to read stories as pragmatic acts, and the development of this proposal forms the theoretical basis for the analysis of deviant, non-standard narratives by Hemingway and Nabokov. Fairly compatible with this view is Rudrum's contention that narrativity should be interpreted in performative terms, and thus assimilate contextual aspects such as tellability and point often dealt with separately. Two other papers by Jukka Tyrkkö and Michael Toolan are brought together because both address the obstacles faced by readers when processing narrative texts. Tyrkkö analyzes the structural pifalls of fragmented, multilinear, or kaleidoscopic narratives—whether hypertextual or encyclopedic—whereas Toolan uses corpus linguistics techniques to determine how the early lexical choices made in a (short) story are indicative—or not—of later thematic developments. Coming now to the issue of transmediality, three papers deal with narrativity across different media. Ansgar Nünning and Roy Sommer argue for the inclusion of drama in the narrative genre, especially on account of its elements of diegetic narrativity, while Monika Fludernik follows suit from the specific angle of her experiential narratology, and Marie-Laure Ryan sets rigorous limits to the concept of transfictionality and tends to accord computer games a narrative status of sorts as against the proposals of the Scandinavian school of ludologists. Finally, under the heading of retelling, José Ángel García Landa spells out his conviction that all stories are reconfigurations of previous ones in such a way that narrativity always entails some form of repetition.

At the outset, I praised the comprehensiveness of this compilation. But there is more to it than a satisfying blend of more or less complementary theoretical positions—it is also a surprisingly rich collection of critical analyses of narrative works that range from brief discussions to full-blown critiques. No doubt these analyses are employed to bring home a number of theoretical points, but at times they are so extensive and insightful that they threaten to encroach upon theory and lead a textual life of their own. This is particularly the case with Penas' discussion of Hemingway's "The Snows of Kilimanjaro" (1936) and Nabokov's *Speak, Memory* (1966) as anti-narrative texts, or Toolan's lexical analysis of the language of guidance in Alice Munro's "The Love of a Good Woman" (1996); but one can also find substantial pieces on Joyce's "Grace" (1914) and *Portrait* (1916), Richardson's *Pamela* (1740), Greene's *Pandosto* (1588), Hardy's *Tess* (1891), etc.

Few objections can be raised about *Theorizing Narrativity*, and all of them are essentially formal. Each chapter concludes with a list of cited references, but, given the thematic cohesiveness of this volume, many entries occur time and again—Genette's *Narrative Discourse*, for instance, is cited in *six* different lists.

This, however, can be easily solved in future reprints by conflating all the lists in one. More disturbing is to notice that misprints and factual errors are by no means rare. One can find, for instance, enigmatic strings such as "over arious stthe image" (402), references to the "American Civil War" (373) when the American War of Independence is clearly intended, the partial repetition of a line at the top of page 275, and an allusion to "six important issues" when *seven* are actually listed (346–49). There are also a number of minor misspellings and grammatical glitches that should be corrected ("court *if* law" 95; "draw attention [to] a curious…" 121; "your" instead of *you* 151; "nothing really take[s] place" 159; "On [the] one hand" 200; "the features . . . *has* led" 293; "theroretical" 419; etc.—my italics in all cases).

Yet it may seem ungracious to point out the existence of these formal oversights when the intellectual achievement of *Theorizing Narrativity* is both impressive and far-reaching. To my mind, the key feature of this collection lies in its daring wealth and irreducible scope, in its thought-provoking potential, and, above all, in its capacity to render problematic an aspect of narrative theory that had reached a kind of self-complacent stability and needed new dynamism.

José Antonio ÁLVAREZ AMORÓS
Universidad de Alicante
jalvarez@ua.es